

May 19, 1967

care, and recognize that improvements can and must be made in the District of Columbia and in other cities around our country.

EXHIBIT 1

THE D.C. FIVE ASKS

To improve the climate of community-police relations in Washington and to aid in the establishment of a professional police force for the nation's capital that legislation and other action be initiated that would include:

1. A general order to all metropolitan police officers fully stating the circumstances under which a gun should be drawn and utilized and when the officer may "shoot to kill."
2. A directive that all officers who have not completed their recruit training have any weapons issued to them withdrawn.
3. That all metropolitan police officers receive, during the next year intensive 3 day courses under qualified experts, in patrol techniques and proper methods of handling specific sorts of problem situations in the community.

In addition that the following recommendations by the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia be put into effect:

1. That terms such as "boy" and "nigger" not be utilized by police when addressing citizens.
2. That rollcall (precinct) training be formalized and conducted regularly under the supervision of the Training Division.
3. That the Department require a college degree for holders of command positions, starting at captain
4. That a formalized field training program for recruits and officers be developed with specially trained "field training officers" to "break in" new recruits to the "best"
5. The 13 week training course include special courses on juvenile procedures, patrol methods, and proper collection and presentation of evidence
6. That no officer, until conclusion of his recruit training, be allowed to patrol alone
7. That the Department recruit specialists in civilian and police fields for top positions in the Department (lateral entry) keeping in mind past racial promotion policies, while providing remedial services for District applicants who fail the entrance requirements due to correctible deficiencies
8. Promotional policies not include numbers of arrests as a rating criterion but give credit to candidates who have pursued their college educations

AMERICANS, ABLE AND WILLING TO WORK, MUST NOT BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST BECAUSE OF AGE—ART BUCHWALD ARTICLE FOCUSES ATTENTION ON PROBLEM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, one of the concerns now being given priority consideration by congressional committees is age discrimination in employment. The Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, recently held a series of hearings on S. 830 and S. 788, bills to prohibit age discrimination in employment. As a result, our subcommittee has ordered S. 830, as amended, reported to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement incomes of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, and as a cosponsor of S. 830, I am keenly

interested in increasing employment opportunities for older workers. Humorous treatment of this subject, which I should like to share with Members of the Congress and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is being included with these remarks. It is a column by Art Buchwald, whose columns appear in the Washington Post. This particular column appeared in the Tuesday, May 16, issue, and is entitled "Too Old To Work." Mr. Buchwald did not intend, I presume, the reader to take his article literally as a prediction that age discrimination will eventually progress to the point indicated in this facetious treatment of the subject. His column does indicate the absurdity of denying employment opportunities to men and women who continue to be alert, energetic, and healthy, merely because they have had too many birthdays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—TOO OLD TO WORK
(By Art Buchwald)

The trouble with the American Dream these days is that there has been such an emphasis on youth in our country that a man can be washed up at the age of 40 and not even know it. I didn't realize how serious it was getting until I started trying to find some jobs for friends who were victims of the World Journal Tribune closing.

The first question people would ask me was, "How old is he?" If I said he was 40 or older I'd get a shrug and some comment like, "He's too old for us."

It seems to me that if the trend continues the age gap is going to be one of the most serious problems this country faces. It's quite possible in another ten or 15 years that the following scene might become very common.

Personnel manager: "I see your qualifications are in order except for one thing."

Applicant: "What's that?"

Personnel manager: "I'm afraid you're too old for the job."

Applicant: "What do you mean, too old for the job? I'm 23."

P.M.: "Yes, I see that. We don't hire anyone over 21 years of age."

Applicant: "But I just got out of college. I've never had a job. How can I be too old?"

P.M.: "According to our pension planners who have the final say as to how old our employees should be, anyone above 21 years of age is over the hill."

Applicant: "How can I be over the hill if I've never been on?"

P.M.: "There's no reason to get testy about this. We have nothing personal against you. It's just that we have found through experience that men of your age really don't do their best work when they reach 23 or 24 years of age. Oh, there have been exceptions, but on the whole we'd rather take our chances with the younger man who can stand up under the physical and mental pressures of the job."

Applicant: "I appreciate your thinking, but I can assure you I can do anything a 21-year-old can do. I'm still very strong. I play tennis twice a week. I'm in excellent health and I was even captain of my football team last year."

P.M.: "Sir, I don't doubt everything you say, but we can't judge you as an individual. Statistics show your age group is prone to colds, backaches and bursitis. Even if we wanted to hire you, our group health insurance advisers wouldn't let us. They

can't afford to take the risk of a 23-year-old man, no matter how healthy he may look."

Applicant: "But if I can't get a job now that I've finished college, what am I going to do the rest of my life?"

P.M.: "Why don't you retire and move to Florida?"

Applicant: "What the hell am I going to retire on if I never worked?"

P.M.: "That's not our fault, is it? Don't forget, this company is in a fiercely competitive market and if we hire older people like yourself we'll have to explain it to our stockholders. Besides, it looks bad when a customer comes in and sees a 23-year-old man hunched over his desk."

Applicant: "I hate to beg, but I really need this job. This is the fourth company I've been to which says I'm too old. Please, mister, give me a chance. I still have ten good years left to me."

P.M.: "I'm sorry, sir. I don't wish to be cold hearted about this but I think you should face reality. You're washed up. You should have planned for your old age years ago."

Applicant: "Let me ask one more question and then I'll go. How old are you?"

P.M.: "Thirteen."

ABM SYSTEM HELD FEASIBLE

MR. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, appears an article entitled "Thin Anti-China ABM Held Feasible by United States." This article was written by the respected and knowledgeable military affairs reporter of the Washington Post, Mr. George C. Wilson. The headline may be slightly misleading since most U.S. officials have long held to the view expressed, and the article is concerned with the views of the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. For Mr. McNamara, this statement represents a radical departure from his previously held view concerning any production and deployment of an ABM system.

In recent weeks, it has become increasingly evident to all knowledgeable observers that the United States must produce and deploy some version of ABM system. Our national security demands it. The only holdout had been the Secretary of Defense.

Even now, the Secretary's decision does not seem to be related to the necessities of our national security. I will not attempt to assess his motives in grudgingly changing his view. It will suffice to say that, in my own judgment, it is necessary that the United States move ahead as promptly as possible with an initial deployment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIN ANTI-CHINA ABM HELD FEASIBLE BY UNITED STATES

(By George C. Wilson)

The United States could build a "thin" missile defense which would protect its population against early Chinese ICBMs without provoking a new arms race with the Soviet Union, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara said yesterday.

He conceded at the same time that "very little progress" has been made toward reaching an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) freeze with the Soviets.

While saying he is still "hopeful" such negotiations will take place, the Defense Secretary indicated his basic opposition is to a full missile defense—not a limited one.

May 19, 1967

enough program activity in the rural areas. (It should be noted that the underfunding of rural areas has not been due to the allocation formula, but rather to the difficulty of developing programs where little economic of social underpinning exists. The difficulty has been in reaching the current allocations, although we have been moving rapidly in this direction.)

We thus think that, insofar as allocation is concerned, New York and the other wealthy States have not been treated unfairly. There remains the question of whether individuals in these States have been treated unfairly by the application of our "poverty lines" to program eligibility. Let me say initially that in general we resist any raising of poverty standards because there are so many people and families remaining below these standards—in every State and metropolitan area. Since we all have a tendency to "cream," to go after the easy cases first, any raising of poverty standards would imply a shift of our very limited funds from the poorest of the poor to those who are somewhat better off.

Nonetheless, there may be some justification for raising the standard in some areas and lowering it in others. This is currently under intensive study—both conceptual and data-gathering. The conceptual problem is not a straightforward one, because of the distinction between "costs of living" and "standards of living." Comparisons of the costs of living are generally based upon the costs of a fixed bundle of goods in different areas. A standard of living comparison takes into account not only the difference in the costs of individual items but also differences among areas in the "normal bundle of goods"—for example, the lack of a good public transportation system in San Francisco means higher transport costs in the "normal bundle" in that area as compared to, say, New York. We believe that standard of living is the relevant concept for inter-area comparisons.

The current data base, however, is inadequate for inter-area comparisons on either a cost of living or a standard of living basis. We cannot now make valid distinctions among regions or between urban and rural districts. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is currently engaged in a study developing an adequate data base on low-income expenditure and price patterns for about 20 individual cities and for regional groupings of other cities. Once this data effort is completed, we will be better able to evaluate the technical difficulties of making standard of living differentiation among areas.

Beyond this, however, we are concerned that even though certain differentiation should become technically feasible, it would not really lay to rest a number of problems. Our experience already suggests that as soon as one deviates from a national standard it is very difficult to decide at what boundaries and subdivisions one stops making particularistic determinations. We have had plenty of examples of small pockets of population which differ in cost and expenditure characteristics from the more general population group which surrounds them. To make really equitable judgments which take into account all particularistic elements is beyond contemporary statistical and technical capabilities and must require subjective judgments which would challenge Solomon's capacity for wisdom. Similarly, one must consider the effect of such differentiated standards on other national standards which are closely related to poverty questions, e.g. the minimum wage.

In the particular case of OEO-funded programs, we have come to the conclusion that we cannot attempt to move to a differentiated poverty line at this time. With funds as extremely limited as they are, we are sure that in every area the numbers of poor far exceed the amount of funds available to

that area. The result of the national standard in the limited fund situation is, then, to exert pressure on the local authorities to really seek out the poorest of the poor, rather than to cream in their programs. I'm sure you'll agree that trying to make sure that these limited funds reach those in the deepest poverty, within any area, is the proper policy.

As I have indicated, we have not reached a firm and final position. I will keep you informed as we move along.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF LIVING CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, today I had the pleasure of a visit with five young Negroes from the District of Columbia. I do not think these young men would mind if I said that none of them spoke with the vigor and flavor of a Stokely Carmichael, but I am sure they would agree that they knew as much or more about the problems of living in the District of Columbia as all the Stokely Carmichaels that have stopped or will stop in this city to stir up the people.

I suspect, Mr. President, that at least some of them have been tempted by crime.

Why, Mr. President, did I agree to sit and talk with these young men? They are not articulate poverty workers. All of them are not exemplary high school students. They are not voters and they do not even have the national following of a Stokely Carmichael.

I talked to them, Mr. President, because these young men, in spite of whatever they did yesterday, have given a great deal of thought to how their city can be improved. They followed up that thought by preparing a petition asking for changes in the District of Columbia. I certainly agree with one of their suggestions. I do not know if I can agree with all or even part of the other specific recommendations contained in that petition, but I do know this, Mr. President, I am going to study and discuss their ideas with other people. Perhaps some of their suggestions are good ones; perhaps some of them can make the Nation's Capital a better place to live. Whatever the outcome I assured these young men that changes do not take place overnight, but without their help and involvement and careful thought rather than destructive speeches and action, it will be extremely hard for meaningful changes ever to come about.

I reminded the boys of a basketball player I heard about named Paul Austin. I understand Paul Austin, a native of the District of Columbia, was a first-rate college basketball player and is now playing with a professional team. Paul Austin did not become a great basketball player overnight. I bet in the early years if he had a nickel for each basket he missed while he was practicing long hours, he would be a very wealthy man.

Now, when we try to improve the District of Columbia we are going to miss some baskets. The Stokely Carmichaels of the Nation can come in and shout: "You missed a basket. Your program did not work." Nevertheless, we all have to

keep shooting baskets and hope that we improve the living conditions and opportunities for young men like those who stopped in my office. We will stand a much better chance of succeeding with a success like that of Paul Austin if we all work together and think about the problems, and talk about the problems, and work out solutions to the problems. When I say we all must do this, if it is going to really work, I am talking about the five young men who were in my office, as well as the Vice President and Senators and Congressmen.

The specific suggestions of the young men in my office primarily concerned the District of Columbia Police force. I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I said before, I may not agree with all their ideas in the statement, but they deserve congratulations for having thought about it, written down their ideas, and presented it to somebody who also cares about making the District of Columbia a better place to live.

I suggested a way to the young men how they and their group—the D.C. Five—could do a lot toward improving the relationship between the police and the community. I suggested that as individuals they should get to know individual policemen. I said:

Stop on the sidewalk and go up and introduce yourself to the policeman. Tell him where you live and what you do and get to know the policeman. Do not go up in a gang to the policeman, but do it as an individual.

It is even possible that such an approach might lead to friendship and understanding between the police and the youth of the Nation's Capital. It would take time and certainly "baskets would be missed" before meaningful signs of success would be apparent. But given a real try by all the youth and police, in the long run I know it would work.

In the District of Columbia, Congress has authorized 3,100 policemen. At the present time, there are only 2,778, or in other words, we have 332 vacancies. Perhaps one of the reasons for the vacancies is that the starting salary for a policeman is too low. Another reason is perhaps that all of us do not respect the police force and law enforcement as much as we should. Certainly, another reason is that the wives and families of policemen always must live with the knowledge that a policeman has a very dangerous occupation.

I understand from the police department that when a new man comes on the force, he undergoes a training course of 13 weeks. He may then be assigned to a desk job for 2 weeks or be assigned to a beat with a veteran officer for 2 weeks. After that he may well be on a beat all alone.

The young men who came to my office should be congratulated for two reasons: first, it makes a lot more sense to try to do something constructive rather than merely yelling "Burn, baby, burn"; second, they should be congratulated for showing that they too are citizens who

1967

McNamara argues that the \$10 billion to \$20 billion ABM system the military Joint Chiefs of Staff want to build would not protect the U.S. population against an all-out Soviet missile attack. He adds that such an ABM system would start a whole new round of weapons building on both sides, thus "destabilizing" the present balance of terror.

But at his press conference yesterday, he said: "I think it is fair to say that we are capable of designing and producing and deploying a system to protect the population against light attacks" but not against heavy attacks. A minimum light defense would cost as little as \$3 billion, according to Pentagon estimates.

Such a light defense, he said, would protect the U.S. population "against the type of attack that the Red Chinese might mount against us in the mid or late 1970s."

The Defense Secretary said there is "definitely a possibility that the United States and Russia both could agree to build light missile defenses."

McNamara stressed he was not taking a stand on whether the United States should build a light missile defense, declaring that the Chinese were not close enough to a missile force to dictate making that decision now.

The bargain-basement light defense would consist of radars for tracking incoming enemy warheads and directing U.S. missiles toward them.

The two types of missiles to be used are the long-range Spartan and short-range Sprint. The light defense would rely primarily on Spartans to protect whole areas of the country rather than city by city.

The Sprints would be mixed in with the Spartans mainly to protect the radars at the ABM sites. The Spartan has a range of about 400 miles and the Sprint 25 miles.

Pentagon weapons specialists say the ABM system Russia is building near Moscow is an area defense relying on missiles like the Sprint. The Soviets also have another crescent of missile sites across the paths U.S. ICBMs would have to travel. There is some dispute within the Pentagon whether this second defense, called the Tallinn system, was built against missiles or high flying bombers.

But McNamara believes that the Tallinn system could be turned into an ABM defense even if it is not one now. So any U.S.-Soviet ABM agreement would have to take the system into account.

President Johnson put \$377 million in his Fiscal 1968 budget to make a start toward building an ABM system if that step seemed desirable after exploring a missile freeze with Russia.

◀BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, much of the time during the past 2 days I have spent listening to testimony to the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, on which I am privileged to serve, and I have been very impressed with the caliber and sincerity of those testifying, as well as with the essence of their recommendations. I am confident the hearings will shed new light on the important topic of bilingual education and lead to landmark legislation, particularly as it relates to the education of Spanish-speaking Americans.

I was pleased this morning to listen to Adalberto M. Guerrero, professor of romance languages at the University of Arizona, Tucson. Dr. Guerrero is very knowledgeable in the field of bilingual education and I recommend his testimony to each Member of this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Adalberto M. Guerrero. I teach at Pueblo High School and at the University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona. I appear here in support of Senate Bill 428. I am indeed grateful for the opportunity to testify today.

Recently there has been much said and written about the matter which concerns us today: the instruction of our Spanish-speaking children in the public schools of the five Southwest states which include Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona and California. It is all part of an exciting and vital movement which is attempting to promote a more realistic education for these students of which there are an estimated 1,680,000 (1966 estimate).

Numerous educational leaders such as Dr. Herschel T. Manuel, Dr. Theodore Andersson, Marcos de León, Maria Urquides and Dr. Bruce Gaarder, have recognized the inadequacy of existing instructional programs for Spanish-speaking students.

The National Education Association, recognizing the dimensions of the problem and aware that individual teachers and school systems were developing more forward-looking solutions built on the basis of bilingualism, conducted a survey in 1965-1966 to gather information about what was going on and to share whatever ideas it got together.

This NEA-Tucson Survey, as it was called, helped to clarify and define the thinking of many educators with regard to the education of these Spanish-speaking children. Salient among the ideas and recommendations gathered by the Survey are the following:

1. In discussing Spanish-speaking children; as Dr. Herschel T. Manuel affirms, "we must ever be mindful that we are dealing with an extremely varied population and with schools that differ widely. Like other children, these children vary in native ability from feeble-minded to genius, in living standards from very low to superior culture, in economic status from extreme poverty to wealth. In language, some are comfortably bilingual when they enter school, many know Spanish only, some have a limited knowledge of English, and some know English only. 'The Spanish-speaking child' turns out to be a number of different children."

2. It is recognized that traditional educational programs for these students have not yielded favorable results, as indicated by statistics such as those compiled by the 1960 United States Census. (The California Teachers Association *Valuator*, Spring 1967, states that out of a student enrollment at U.C.L.A. of 26,000 only 70 are of Spanish surname).

3. The Spanish-speaking population of the Southwest in general, paradoxically, because of its linguistic background, constitutes a dormant, priceless national resource.

4. Practical economic motives and our National interest will be served more advantageously by exploiting the potential talent of the group.

5. Realistic instructional programs requisite for developing the aptitudes of the Spanish-speaking students in our schools acknowledge the importance of teaching English as a second language and the use of Spanish as a medium of instruction. Instruction in preschools and throughout the early grades should be in both Spanish and English.

6. An unalterable policy of all school personnel must be one which will insure the gradual mastery of English by all pupils in the schools.

7. Special instructional programs for these

students are not designed to isolate them, nor are they established to make better Mexicans of them. These programs propose to develop a more positive self concept in these students. Therefore, measures should be taken to help these students gain a pride in their ancestral culture and language. Through these programs their educational opportunities will be enhanced and this will help them mature into more worthy and more valuable American citizens.

8. The ultimate success of any educational program is intimately related to the aptitude, the professional preparation, and the attitude of the individual teacher. It is strongly recommended that schools recruit more Spanish-speaking teachers and aids.

9. Schools, colleges and universities must conduct research in bilingual education. They must train special teachers to meet this special challenge. They must also develop materials which will be used in the more imaginative and realistic programs for the Spanish-speaking child.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been most valuable in promoting better education in America. But it is not enough by itself. There are still countless districts and schools which have not yet received the help they so urgently need. The Federal Government must assume the responsibility of providing economic aid which will stimulate guided innovation and research at the state, as well as at the local level, as recommended to and by the NEA-Tucson Survey.

NEED FOR A NATIONAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on April 28, Mr. Jonathan Lindley, a Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Department of Commerce, delivered a most interesting paper before the National Planning Association on the subject of "The Economic Environment and Urban Development." Mr. Lindley, who was formerly a staff member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, has pointed out that we need to have a national policy to order future urban growth. During the decade of the 1950's, 10 million people migrated from rural to urban areas and a similar population movement is expected during the 1960's. Many of these migrants are pouring into our already overcrowded large central cities creating problems of unemployment and social disorganization.

Regardless of the future pattern of urban growth, it is absolutely imperative that we formulate an adequate national urban development policy. We cannot continue to pour money into our cities without an increasingly critical examination of the underlying economic and population trends affecting urban growth.

What is true in housing and urban development is no less true for other domestic programs. We must have rational planning, based on the best and most pertinent data available, which takes into account social as well as economic considerations. In this connection, I have introduced proposed legislation providing for a Council of Social Advisers, and an annual social report by the President.

Mr. Lindley's remarks are especially pertinent to the need which my bill seeks

S 7164

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 19, 1967

to meet; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Paper by Jonathan Lindley, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Coordination, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, presented to Eighth Annual Conference Center for Economic Projections, National Planning Association, April 28, 1967)

The subject of this panel is general enough to permit a participant to choose from a wide range of subjects. I intend to explore some of the determinants of our physical and social environment; how they have changed in the past; and how and why they will change in the future.

I should add that I do not approach this subject as a simon-pure social scientist, but merely as a harassed bureaucrat who takes comfort in that paradoxical admonition, "never let the facts stand in the way of the truth". Much of what I have to say rests on a shaky foundation of fact and data. Much is simple observation and intuition. However, from this assortment of information and reflections, I hope to provide a viewpoint which may help to predict more accurately our future physical environment needs.

ESTIMATING FUTURE NEEDS

Our physical and social environment is affected by the places where people live and work. Given modern technology, it tends to be the human environment that shapes the physical environment rather than the reverse process which is more characteristic of technologically primitive societies.

By definition, much of our physical and social environment is *locationally oriented or determined*. Many of the physical and social environmental problems and needs of the next decade will be shaped by the way of life—in terms of location—that our population will choose in the future; or by the way of living that the population will be forced to choose because of the forces affecting population migration and location.

Attempts to define physical environmental needs through estimates of population growth and composition that are solely aggregative in character may obscure many, if not most, of the problems of the physical environment that are caused by the shifts in location of that total population over time.

Therefore, in order to look ahead intelligently and plan for—or as the case may be, against—the future physical environment, we need some estimate of not just the gross population growth and the composition of that population in the future, but some idea of where that population will be located—in the rural hinterlands, in the major urban complexes, or elsewhere—and perhaps more importantly why the population will locate in those places. Once we have an estimate about the location of the future population—and perhaps more importantly the determinants affecting that location pattern—then we may be in a better position to predict, understand, influence, and perhaps control the future problems of our physical environment. To establish the framework for and adequate policy for the future physical environment, there are four issues which I intend to discuss:

The trends in the location of people and the influence of jobs;

Some causes of job and population migration;

The resulting need for an integrated economic-urban development policy;

Some implications for investment in physical and social facilities.

THE LONGRUN TREND: THE LOCATION OF JOBS AND PEOPLE

Because of the rapid growth in productivity in agriculture and the depletion of mineral and other resources in many rural hinterland areas, over 10 million persons migrated in the 1950-1960 decade from the rural areas to urban areas.

There is every indication that the growth in productivity in agriculture and extractive industries will continue over the next 10 years and consequently that the migration of people from rural to urban areas will also continue.

Because the future location of both people and job opportunities is crucial to the Department of Commerce's area and regional economic development mission, the Economic Development Administration is attempting to generate some rough estimates which would indicate the future nature and location of areas of potentially high and persistent unemployment. To do this requires estimating future employment and population trends and disaggregating these national trends in order to analyze a subnational or area economy.

Some of the preliminary results of EDA's projections on the location of jobs and people are now available. From these estimates, EDA has derived some indication of the relationship between county size and projected employment growth rate for the period of 1960-1975. The following table summarizes that data:

Relations between county size and projected employment growth rate for 1960-75¹

1960 counties or local governments with population of—	Number of counties	Percent with projected employment growth less than the national average
Less than 10,000.....	823	82
10,000 to 50,000.....	1,652	71
50,000 to 100,000.....	292	28
100,000 to 500,000.....	238	25
500,000 to 1,000,000.....	49	65
Over 1,000,000.....	16	87

¹ Assuming 4 percent national average unemployment rate.

The results are quite startling.

They show that job growth in both low population counties and counties with a large population, such as counties containing or included in major urban complexes, will be at a much lower rate than that of the national average. On the other hand, those counties of moderate size, with a population of 50,000 through 500,000 will have a job growth rate significantly greater than the national average.

However, the data in Table I is aggregated in terms of county or local government units, and for many purposes it would be very helpful to know what the future population migration and job location specifics would be for major metropolitan areas since they include such a large percent of our total population, and what the future trends for job and population location might be within the major urban complexes in the next decade. Therefore a second set of estimates (under different assumptions) was made of both population and job growth in the major urban complexes. The question asked was: "Assuming no migration occurred into or out of major complexes of over 1 million population, what would be the relationship between future jobs and future population both for major metropolitan complexes and within these metropolitan complexes?" Table II summarizes the data from these projections.

Short-fall of jobs in major urban areas assuming no migration—Urban complexes of over 1,000,000 population, 1966-75 migration required to balance people with jobs, assuming 4-percent rate of unemployment

[In millions of people]

	Total		Excluding California, 25 largest complexes
	10 largest complexes	29 largest complexes	
1976 population if no migration occurs into or out of the complexes.....	63.0	96.6	72.0
Migration required by 1976 to balance people and jobs, total.....	-4.0	-4.6	-7.1
Cities less suburbs and outer ring counties.....	-5.9	-7.4	-8.4
Associated suburbs and outer ring counties.....	+1.9	+2.8	+1.3
Migration required to balance jobs and people as percent of 1976 population.....	-6.3	-4.8	-9.8
Comparable 1960-69 migration rate (percent).....	+6.5	+10.0	+6.1

¹ + indicates in-migration; - indicates out-migration.

THE POTENTIAL MISMATCH OF JOBS AND PEOPLE

Again the results are startling.

The data suggests that the major urban complexes face a serious problem of providing their population with jobs in the future and therefore that a large-scale economic adjustment process is going to have to take place within the urban complexes. The data leads us to this conclusion even though the data has been based on the most optimistic assumption of no additional migration to our major cities. Indeed, the estimates indicate that in order to achieve an unemployment rate of 4 percent, there must be a net outmigration of population of 6.3 percent from our ten largest urban complexes and 8.8 percent from our 29 largest complexes over the period 1960-1975. This substantial imbalance exists even while taking into account the offsetting growth of jobs in the suburbs of these cities.

Moreover, if we relax the "no migration" assumption underlying the figures in Table II, the problem looms even larger. Some other studies have shown that the rural poor will continue to go to the major cities although perhaps at a somewhat slower migration rate. It is this segment of the migrant group that has great difficulty in preparing to cope with and surmount the economic, cultural, and social environment of the central city.

In short, it appears that there may be a major mismatch in the future of the projected location of people and jobs in most major urban centers.

I do not pretend to be either a statistician or an econometrician. However, imperfect these estimates may be, if they at least tend in the right direction they signal difficulties ahead. Our success in attempting to overcome the problems of the unemployed, the poor, and the minorities will hinge to a considerable extent on solving the predicted locational job population mismatch. In a broad sense, the estimates begin to define the trend in future urban, social, and economic problems.

In the future, relatively few new employment opportunities will be created in or around urban places of 20,000 or less population. Most jobs will be created in communities of 50,000 or more population. Therefore one ought to look at the future national "jobs" landscape as a system of urban places.

SOME CAUSES OF POPULATION AND JOB LOCATION

Again, reverting to the role of an observer of the scene rather than a social scientist,